

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 93 04:30:18 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #225
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 13 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 225

Today's Topics:

 Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
 Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams
 The FCC

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1993 15:29:33 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ncc2001@cwis.unomaha.edu (Michael Fortner) writes:

> mike@vatican.cdp.org writes:
>
>> (Stuff Deleted)
>>
>> Lets take cancer. Over several months, you have a variety of symptoms.
>> Sore throat, raspy voice, cough. None of them particular serious symptoms.
>> But then, you visit the doctor. BING! Throat cancer, you have 3 months
>> to live.
>>
>> I see the same thing happening to amateur radio. Slowly, its been turned
>> into another 11 meters.
>>
>> (More Stuff Deleted)

>>
>> Next we were blessed with the wonderful no-code license. In *THIS* area
>> (see if you can understand that, Dana) I would say that 90% of the no-codes
>> are CB-transplants. 10-4. I'll be on the side. You have yourself a super-fi
> ne
>> one. I gotta back on outta here. Basically, they became hams because when
>> they unkeyed their mobile CB radio, it didn't go "bleep". Of course, there
> are
>> some really good no-codes. However, most of them already upgraded.
>
> Excuse me, but I am waiting for my no-code and I am not a CBer. I did 4 year
> s
> in the Air Force as an Electronic Warfare Systems Technician. I have tried
> before to learn code, but have had a lot of trouble with it. Not all of us
> out here are blessed with the ear for morse code and/or the time to study
> the code. That does not make us second class operators. We can and often
> do contribute to the hobby. In fact, if it was not for the no-code license,
> your precious bands, cw and phone, would be quickly gobbled up by commercial
> interests citing a lack of interest in amateur radio to justify the use for
> just a few operators.

What the hell are you talking about? The only reason we have the HF bands is because nobody really wants them. Lets face it, with satellites, it's become obsolete for government and industry. The No-Code license has nothing to do with the saving of the HF bands. It didn't need to be saved.

Granted, it might have saved some of the VHF/UHF bands but think about that. Even with the influx of amateurs we still lost part of 220MHz, have been forced to share 70cm with Wind Profiler radars, and now we get to share the 33cm band with cordless phones and all sorts of other goodies. How much worse could it get?

>> Of course, let's not forget re-writing the Novice/Tech question pools so
>> a 14-year-old can understand them. (Hell, that's DISCRIMINATION! There are
>> 5 year old hams! Why not re-write the pools for a 5-year-old reading
>> comprehension level?)
>
> So, what is wrong with getting more young people into the hobby? If more
> teens and pre-teens start being hams, it could take a way the social view
> of an amateur radio operator as some socially-phobic techno-geek. It seems
> to me that what you are afraid of is there being more people getting their
> license and stop the hobby from appearing as (and in some areas, being) an
> old-boys club.

If more people took the time to finish 8th grade we wouldn't have to lower the standards.

>> Ooops, can't forget that lovely "elimination of the station location"
>> information on the 610. Hell, why should the FCC need that info? After
>> all, its not like they're actually going to USE it and find some jammers
>> now, is it? Nah, besides, its too much typing for the data entry clerks.
>

> Now on this subject I agree with you. What the FCC needs is the funds and
> the teeth to enforce the laws concerning the use of the radio spectrum.
> Of course, our new president is concerned with spending our tax dollars
> making the lives of those who wish for the state to support them easier.

One point I agree with you on. I'd be fully willing to spend \$25.00
every two years to keep my amateur license. It'd be worth it for the
enforcement alone. But because of the way congress and the FCC interact,
it'll probably never happen.

>> Now, we have the elimination of the two-general Novice exam, and now the
>> concept of "instant callsigns" on the table. Just wonderful. And I won't
>> even get into the special "club" callsign fiasco which was designed simply
>> to allow the ARRL to administer.

>
> I've been waiting for over 7 weeks for my callsign. I called the FCC at
> (717) 337-1511 and found out that the waiting time for my area (0) is 6 to 8
> weeks for amateurs, but only 2 to 3 weeks for commercial interests. So much
> for all men being equal. You are only equal when you are willing to assert
> your rights to be treated fairly. Hams across the country need to let their
> elected representatives in Washington, D.C. know that they are tired of being
> treated as second-class citizens by the FCC.

There're only 600,000 of us, and of that maybe 5% would actually scream
to their reps. That's not a hell of a lot of constituents so the congress
critters just turn a deaf ear on it.

>> If you can't see it people, you're blind. The ARRL has systematically
>> attempted, and has managed to succeed, to increase its power base and
>> monopolistic control over amateur radio in the United States, in the
>> name of "amateur radio". And the FCC, taking the word of the ARRL as
>> gospel, is ruining the hobby in the process. Been on 20 meters lately?

>>
>> Everything has been done in the name of making things "easy". Let's make it
>> easy for people to get their amateur ticket. That way we'll increase our
>> ranks (not to mention the number of ads the equipment manufacturers will
>> run in QST to advertise to all those new hams). Yesiree, that's the ticket.
>> Ooops, pardon the pun.

>
> This has come about only because the amateur community does not want to put
> forth the effort to write Washington about their views, and want someone else
> to do it for them. We as amateurs are to blame for this. We must let those
> who think they know best for us that they are crazy and get out of our lives.

We have written Washington, only to have the ARRL overstep us and assert their views of the way things should be. You must be really naive about the way our government works. :)

```
>> (Yet More Stuff Deleted)
>>
>> The cancer is spreading, and chemotherapy is needed.
>
> Perhaps, but self-treatment is needed. Many of the complaints about code are
>
> based on the fact that novices and no-code techs have no dx voice privileges,
> with the exception of the often closed 6 meter band. To give them a taste of
> dx and an incentive to upgrade, I think that they should be allowed some
> limited voice on 10 meters. This should encourage them to learn the code if
> they can or want to.
```

Actually, I'd be for giving no-coders 10m. It's a fairly useless band right now but good for local contacts and practice!

Tony

```
o      o Tony Pelluccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
 \   / system @ garlic.sbs.com
  \_/
 (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
 /| ___ \ \
 / | {MTV}|| MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
 * ||{__}|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
  ||----|| ^^
  ^^
```

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1993 08:13:01 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntp2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Well I just got back from the full village board meeting and never got the chance to ask for a reason. Comments and all were solicited before the consent agenda was voted on (I suppose I could have asked "If you vote my petition down, what would be the reason?") but I thought the "Communications and Petitions" section of the meeting would have afforded me the opportunity to ask. Guess not.

In any case the village assistant manager (as opposed to the village

manager and the village president, can you spell bureaucrat? Actually he seemed like a pretty good guy as compared to the village manager or village president.) talked to me and said the village (probably their attorney) would send me a letter stating the reason for the denial. We'll see.

Makes you kind of wonder what "Land of the free" really means? Must be everything is free and provided by the government, because our rights are certainly being trod upon in a big way. Can't wait until they enact legislation telling me I can't park my car in my own drive way. RV's and boats are already prohibited, cars should be next.

On a related matter, before the board were some ordinances to involuntarily annex a number of properties into the village. Neat trick, you surround the property on three sides and find a natural barrier on the fourth side and you can annex them without their consent. The village said there would be "no negative effects" only positive ones with respect to services, etc. Given that the villages portion of my property tax bill accounts for several hundred dollars, I guess that's not really a negative impact. I feel sorry for these poor people that get to be part of the village whether they want to or not. Sigh. Big Brother and Big Government here we come!

73,
Todd
N9MWB

PS Please, enough with the tangents from this thread.

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 93 00:41:46 EDT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!wariat.org!nraven!floyd@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The FCC
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Somewhere I remember reading that the Amateur Service was self-policeing. Now, I may have been terribly mistaken, but I don't think so. However, it is true that someone definately needs to light a flame under the FCC's backside, but look at it from their point of few. Our licenses are free... we're not giving them anything... why should they give anything to us?

I am a No-Code Tech. It dosen't mean I'm a poor operator... I try to be the best operator that I can be, and I hope that it sets an example for others who listen to me on the radio. (I also hope to get my code speed up to 13wpm within the next 2 weeks and upgrade to become a real amateur already!) The sad fact is that there is a good number of these no-code technicians who just want this to be another CB. It's

usually very easy to tell who these people are, and I won't go into any further detail, someone has already posted the various phrases so adored by these "good-buddies." Unfortunatly, VHF/UHF will be plagued with Children's Band rejects forever now!

Before I my licensed arrived, I was out taking beam-headings, trying to track down a group of individual jamming one of the repeaters about 3 miles from my house. The abuses had been going on for close to 6 months, and the only people looking were 3 no-codes, and me with only a CSCE. Now, you tell me where the real problem with the amateur community lies? The fact is Wayne Green is right! The amateur service went geriatric. <sp> (BTW- The abuses have been going on for a year now, 3 groups have tracked all 3 people and served to confirm findings, and who knows what the FCC will bother to do... they're as bad as the trustees of the club which cared to do nothing about it.....)

Oh well... maybe it's just time we tried to be good amateurs again, and went after those who refuse to be.

73 de N8VUR

--

-- Douglas A. Dever -- Floyd@nraven.wariat.org
QSO on 146.82/R Anytime!

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #225
